

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

SOCORRO HURTADO-GARCIA,

Petitioner,

v.

Civil No. 2:13-CV-11383  
HONORABLE GEORGE CARAM STEEH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

STEVE RIVARD,

Respondent,

/

**OPINION AND ORDER SUMMARILY DISMISSING THE  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND  
DECLINING TO ISSUE A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

Socorro Hurtado-Garcia, ("Petitioner"), confined at the St. Louis Correctional Facility in St. Louis, Michigan, filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 with this Court on or about March 28, 2013. On April 1, 2013, Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen signed an "Order to Correct Deficiency," in which petitioner was ordered to submit a \$ 5.00 fee for filing a habeas corpus petition or an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* within twenty one days of the order. For the reasons stated below, petitioner's action is dismissed without prejudice because of petitioner's failure to comply with an order of the court.

Petitioner's application is subject to dismissal, because he failed to comply with the order of deficiency by either submitting the \$ 5.00 filing fee or an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

If a prisoner who seeks habeas corpus relief does not comply with a district court's directions in a deficiency order, regarding the prisoner's failure to pay the full

filing fee and his failure to provide the required documentation to apply to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the district court must presume that the prisoner is not a pauper, assess the full filing fee, and dismiss the case for want of prosecution. See *Gravitt v. Tyszkiewicz*, 14 Fed. Appx. 348, 349 (6th Cir. 2001)(citing *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F. 3d 601, 605 (6th Cir. 1997)). The deficiency order clearly stated that petitioner was required to submit either the \$ 5.00 filing fee or an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The deficiency order also expressly warned petitioner that failure to comply with the order could result in the dismissal of his action. Because petitioner failed to pay the filing fee or submit the required application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, his petition is subject to dismissal for want of prosecution. *Gravitt*, 14 Fed. Appx. at 349.

The Court will summarily dismiss the petition for writ of habeas corpus without prejudice. The Court will also deny a certificate of appealability to petitioner. In order to obtain a certificate of appealability, a prisoner must make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When a district court denies a habeas petition on procedural grounds without reaching the prisoner's underlying constitutional claims, a certificate of appealability should issue, and an appeal of the district court's order may be taken, if the petitioner shows that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petitioner states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). When a plain procedural bar is present and the district court is correct to invoke it to dispose of the case, a reasonable jurist could not conclude either that the district court erred in dismissing the petition or that the petition should be allowed to proceed further.

In such a circumstance, no appeal would be warranted. *Id.* The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant.” Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, Rule 11(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254.

The Court will deny petitioner a certificate of appealability, because the dismissal of the petition based on petitioner’s failure to cure his filing deficiencies would not be debatable amongst jurists of reason. *See Soeken v. Estep*, 270 Fed. Appx. 734, 735-36 (10th Cir. 2008).

Based upon the foregoing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. Nothing in this order precludes petitioner from submitting a new habeas petition with payment of the filing fee or the *in forma pauperis* application.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 6, 2013

s/George Caram Steeh  
GEORGE CARAM STEEH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record on May 6, 2013, by electronic and/or ordinary mail and also on Socorro Hurtado-Garcia #802791, St. Louis Correctional Facility, 8585 N. Croswell Road, St. Louis, MI 48880.

s/Barbara Radke  
Deputy Clerk